

Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 227368 TOSEC 270108

64

ORIGIN PRS-01

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SS-15 NSC-05 SSO-00 NSCE-00 CCO-00 /022 R

DRAFTED BY S/PRS:FZBROWN:SM

APPROVED BY S/PRS - FREDERICK Z. BROWN

S/S - RGAMBLE

----- 113055

O 142353Z SEP 76 ZFF4

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO USDEL SECRETARY IMMEDIATE

UNCLAS STATE 227368 TOSEC 270108

FOR EAGLEBURGER FROM BROWN (S/PRS)

E.O. 11652: N/A

TAGS: SOPN, OVIP (KISSINGER, HENRY A.)

SUBJECT: DAILY PRESS BRIEFING TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14

NO. 5

FOLLOWING IS VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT OF DAILY PRESS BRIEFING
FOR TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1976:

"Q: COULD YOU EXPLAIN WHAT THE DISTINCTION -- THAT IS, THE
ATTEMPT THAT IS NOW BEING MADE TO BE DRAWN BETWEEN NEGOTIAT-
ING WITH TERRORISTS AND TALKING WITH TERRORISTS?

A: THE FIRST POINT I WOULD MAKE IS THAT THERE HAS BEEN NO
CHANGE IN OUR ANTI-TERRORISM POLICIES. I THINK IT IS IMPOR-
TANT TO MAKE CLEAR THAT OUR ANTI-TERRORISM POLICY DOES NOT
RULE OUT TALKS -- DISCUSSIONS -- WITH THE ABDUCTORS. THAT
HAS ALWAYS BEEN THE CASE AND THESE DISCUSSIONS ARE STRICTLY
CONFINED TO SUCH MATTERS AS DETERMINING THE WELL-BEING OF
THE HOSTAGES AND REQUESTING ON HUMANITARIAN GROUNDS THE UN-
CONDITIONAL RELEASE OF THE HOSTAGES INVOLVED. NOW AS I
HAVE JUST SAID, THIS DOES NOT REPRESENT A CHANGE OR AN
UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 STATE 227368 TOSEC 270108

ALTERATION FROM OUR ESTABLISHED ANTI-TERRORISM POLICY, AND
THAT POLICY WAS ADHERED TO IN THE MOST RECENT CASE.

Q: BUT IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE, THE DEMAND OF THE TERROR-

ISTS WAS MET IN THE FBI ASKING NEWSPAPERS -- CERTAIN NEWS-PAPERS ANYWAY -- TO PUBLISH THE DOCUMENT THAT THEY WANTED PUBLISHED. ISN'T THIS AN ACCESSION TO THESE PEOPLE?

A: WITH REGARD TO THE FBI, HENRY, I THINK YOU HAD BETTER ADDRESS ANY QUESTION WITH REGARD TO THEIR ACTIONS TO THEM.

Q: ARE YOU SUGGESTING THERE ISN'T ONE COORDINATED GOVERNMENT POLICY? THAT IN FACT IT IS SPLIT UP IN DIFFERENT AGENCIES OF GOVERNMENT THAT SET DIFFERENT RULES FOR THE POLICIES?

A: NO, THERE IS ONE COORDINATED POLICY ON ANTI-TERRORISM, WHICH I JUST STATED -- THE GRAND LINES OF IT. . . AND IN RESPONSE TO HENRY'S QUESTION, I SIMPLY HAVE TO SUGGEST THAT ANY QUESTION ON THE FBI'S ACTION BE ADDRESSED TO THEM.

Q: DO YOU REGARD THAT AS A PAYOFF IN KIND, OR A PAYOFF OF ANY KIND?

A: NO. ABSOLUTELY NOT.

Q: . . . YOU TALK ABOUT THERE BEING NO CHANGE IN THE ANTI-TERRORISM POLICY. NOW THAT IS NOT A SURPRISING STATEMENT SINCE I DON'T THINK THERE HAS EVER BEEN AN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF CHANGE OF ANY POLICY. BUT . . . HOW DID YOU DEFINE THE ANTI-TERRORISM POLICY UNTIL TODAY, WHEN YOU ARE NOW ALLOWING FOR TALKS CONCERNING THE WELL-BEING, UNCONDITIONAL RELEASE, ETC? WHAT WAS IT BEFORE? WHAT WAS THE LANGUAGE THAT WAS USED?

A: IT HAS BEEN THAT. IT HAS BEEN THAT, AND --

Q: WELL, YOU HAVE --

A: WHAT WE HAVE RULED OUT IS CONCESSION, MARVIN, AND THERE IS A GREAT DEAL OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN CONCESSION, WHICH WE UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 03 STATE 227368 TOSEC 270108

ARE RULING OUT, AND DISCUSSION OR TALK. YOU HAVE TO COMMUNICATE WITH THESE PEOPLE IN ORDER TO FIND OUT WHAT IS GOING ON AND IN ORDER TO DETERMINE YOUR BEST TACTICAL MOVE. THAT IS WHAT TOOK PLACE OVER THE WEEKEND. THAT HAS NOT CHANGED. THAT HAS BEEN THE STANDARD POLICY.

Q: HOW IS PUBLISHING THEIR PROPAGANDA NOT A CONCESSION, PARTICULARLY WHEN PART OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT -- WHICH, YOU SAY, HAS A COORDINATED POLICY -- IS INVOLVED IN HELPING GET IT PUBLISHED?

A: THERE WAS NO WAY THAT WE COULD HAVE INTERFERED WITH THE PUBLISHING WHICH TOOK PLACE. WE WERE NOT IN A POSI-

TION TO STOP THAT, SINCE IT VIOLATED NO LAW, AND IT TOOK PLACE. NOW THAT DOES NOT MEAN THAT WE APPROVED OF IT. WE DID NOT APPROVE OF IT.

Q: NOW WAS THE STATE DEPARTMENT INFORMED OF WHAT WAS GOING ON --

Q: WELL, LET HIM FINISH -- LET'S FINISH --

Q: SORRY.

A: LET'S FINISH HENRY'S LINE OF QUESTIONING FIRST.

Q: WELL, FINISH YOURS. YOU SAID YOU DID NOT APPROVE --

A: NO, I SAID IT WAS NOT WITH OUR APPROVAL.

Q: DID YOU SAY, 'WE DID NOT APPROVE OF THE PUBLISHING'?

A: I SAID IT WAS NOT DONE WITH OUR APPROVAL.

Q: DID YOU, OR DID YOU NOT --

Q: WELL, THAT LEADS TO THE NEXT QUESTION, THOUGH: DID YOU KNOW ABOUT IT WHEN IT WAS HAPPENING OR BEFORE IT HAPPENED? DID THE FBI CONSULT THE STATE DEPARTMENT? WAS THERE ANY COORDINATION -- OR WAS THIS JUST SOMETHING --

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 04 STATE 227368 TOSEC 270108

A: WE WERE AWARE --

Q: -- WHERE YOU WOKE UP THE NEXT MORNING AND FOUND IT?

A: OBVIOUSLY, THE DEPARTMENT WAS AWARE OF THE DEMANDS WHICH THE TERRORISTS HAD PUBLICIZED.

Q: NO, THAT IS NOT THE QUESTION. THE QUESTION IS WHETHER--

A: YOU ARE ASKING WHETHER OR NOT WE WERE AWARE OF IT. OF COURSE WE WERE AWARE OF WHAT THEIR DEMANDS WERE.

Q: WAS THE DEPARTMENT CONSULTED BEFORE, AND GIVEN A CHANCE TO OFFER AN OPINION ON THE FBI'S GOING OUT AND TELLING THE NEWSPAPERS TO PLEASE PUBLISH THIS DOCUMENT? WERE YOU BROUGHT INTO IT AT THAT EARLY A STAGE?

A: LET'S JUST SAY THAT WE WERE KNOWLEDGEABLE OF WHAT WAS GOING ON. THERE WAS CONSULTATION.

Q: EVEN BEFORE THE FBI WENT TO THE NEWSPAPERS?

A: WE WERE AWARE OF WHAT WAS GOING ON.

Q: NOW ARE YOU SAYING THAT THE FBI ACTED INDIVIDUALLY, THEN?

A: I SUGGEST YOU ASK ANY QUESTIONS WITH REGARD TO THE FBI'S ACTION TO THE FBI.

Q: NO, IT WAS YOUR VIEW OF THE FBI'S ACTION, YOUR VIEW OF THE ACTION.

A: NO, I AM NOT GOING TO OFFER A VIEW OF THAT. I HAVE ALREADY OFFERED A VIEW ON WHETHER OR NOT WE APPROVED OF THE DROPPING OF THE LEAFLETS AND THE PUBLISHING OF STATEMENTS. I HAVE SAID THAT THAT WAS NOT DONE WITH OUR APPROVAL. THERE WAS NO WAY IN WHICH WE COULD INTERVENE SINCE NO LAWS WERE BEING VIOLATED. AND I THINK I WILL LEAVE IT AT THAT.

Q: DID YOU EXPRESS YOUR DISAPPROVAL, THOUGH, AT THE TIME UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 05 STATE 227368 TOSEC 270108

WHEN IT STILL HAD NOT YET BEEN DONE, AND DISAPPROVAL MIGHT HAVE BEEN TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT?

A: I AM NOT INFORMED OF THE INS AND OUTS OF THE DISCUSSIONS WHICH WENT ON SATURDAY NIGHT AND EARLY SUNDAY MORNING, HENRY. BUT I HAVE ALREADY SAID THAT THIS WAS NOT DONE WITH OUR APPROVAL AND --

Q: BUT 'NOT DONE WITH OUR APPROVAL' COULD SIMPLY MEAN YOU WERE STANDING OFF IN ANOTHER ROOM WHEN THE DECISION WAS MADE. THE QUESTION IS WHETHER YOU WERE STANDING THERE AND SAYING, 'THIS IS A BAD IDEA.'

A: I WANT TO POINT OUT THAT THE DEMANDS WERE NOT ADDRESSED TO THE USG. THEY WERE ADDRESSED TO TWA AND TO THE NEWSPAPERS INVOLVED. AS I STATED . . WE, THE STATE DEPARTMENT, WERE NOT IN A POSITION TO INTERVENE, SINCE NO LAW WAS BEING BROKEN IN THE PUBLICATION OR THE DROPPING.

Q: YOU SAID, 'NO CONCESSIONS,' RIGHT?

A: RIGHT, THAT IS PRECISELY WHAT I SAID.

Q: IS IT TRUE THAT THE HIJACKERS ASKED FOR TALKS WITH THE PRESIDENT, KISSINGER OR RUSH?

A: I DON'T KNOW.

Q: I BELIEVE THAT IS --

A: I HAVE CERTAINLY SEEN REPORTS TO THAT EFFECT, BUT I

CANNOT TELL YOU, FROM MY KNOWLEDGE OF THIS INCIDENT,
WHETHER OR NOT THEY DID, MARVIN.

Q: DID AMBASSADOR RUSH TALK TO THEM?

A: IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING HE DID, YES.

Q: WELL, HOW WAS THAT NOT YIELDING TO ONE OF THEIR DEMANDS?
HOW IS THAT NOT A CONCESSION?

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 06 STATE 227368 TOSEC 270108

A: I HAVE JUST DEFINED THAT A PART OF OUR POLICY WITH REGARD TO ANTI-TERRORISM MUST NECESSARILY INVOLVE COMMUNICATION WITH THE ABDUCTORS. AMBASSADOR RUSH'S COMMUNICATION WITH THEM SHOULD BE SEEN IN THAT LIGHT. . . AND YOU HAVE TO EVALUATE EVERY SITUATION OF THIS SORT IN A TACTICAL SENSE. THIS ACTION IS WHAT WAS FELT TO BE CORRECT AND USEFUL FROM OUR POINT OF VIEW AT THAT TIME; AND IT DOES NOT REPRESENT A CONCESSION. IT REPRESENTS --

Q: ANY TERRORIST POLICY, AS IT HAS BEEN DEFINED HERE, I BELIEVE MANY, MANY TIMES, IS THAT WE WILL NOT NEGOTIATE WITH TERRORISTS.

A: THAT IS CORRECT. . . THERE IS A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN NEGOTIATION AND CONCESSION ON THE ONE HAND AND COMMUNICATION ON THE OTHER -- WHICH IS A VITAL PART OF THE MANAGEMENT OF A CRISIS SITUATION.

Q: DEFINE THAT PLEASE. DEFINE THAT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN NEGOTIATING AND TALKING.

A: I THINK THERE IS A LOT OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN COMMUNICATION, IN THE LARGE SENSE, AND A NEGOTIATION, GIVE-AND-TAKE TRADING, ETC. -- AND THAT IS WHAT WE DID NOT GET INVOLVED IN, MARVIN. I THINK THERE IS A CLEAR DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO IDEAS.

Q: NO, BUT YOU ARE NOT DEFINING IT, ARE YOU? JUST DEFINE THE SIMPLE DIFFERENCE. IF IT'S SO CLEAR TO YOU, COULD YOU MAKE IT CLEAR TO ME? WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN 'WE WILL NOT NEGOTIATE' AND 'WE WILL TALK'?

A: I HAVE JUST DESCRIBED WHAT THE LIMITS OF OUR COMMUNICATION INVOLVE: CONFINED TO MATTERS SUCH AS DETERMINING THE WELL-BEING OF THE HOSTAGES, AND REQUESTING THAT THEY BE RELEASED. AND I THINK THAT CARRIES WITH IT THE FULL SENSE. . . IT IS THE MANAGEMENT OF A CRISIS -- A TACTICAL SITUATION. AND THAT IS THE SENSE OF THE COMMUNICATION. NEGOTIATION AND CONCESSION, ON THE OTHER HAND, CARRIES WITH IT ALL OTHER SORTS OF CONNOTATIONS, IT SEEMS TO ME, MARVIN.

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 07 STATE 227368 TOSEC 270108

Q: YOU ARE NOT DEFINING IT, THOUGH. THAT IS QUITE CLEAR.

A: I THINK EVERY SITUATION IS DIFFERENT, AND IT WOULD BE VERY DIFFICULT TO GIVE YOU A BLANKET DEFINITION OF NEGOTIATION WHICH WOULD COVER ALL THE HIJACK INCIDENTS THAT HAVE COME UP IN RECENT YEARS.

Q: IT WAS NEVER DIFFICULT BEFORE.

A: IN WHAT SENSE, MARVIN?

Q: WELL, IT STARTED WITH PRESIDENT NIXON COMING OUT WITH BLANKET STATEMENTS FROM THE VERY TIME THAT AN AMERICAN AMBASSADOR WAS BEING HELD IN KHARTOUM AND THE AMBASSADOR WAS SUBSEQUENTLY KILLED.

AND THERE HAVE BEEN ANY NUMBER OF STATEMENTS FROM LEADING AMERICAN OFFICIALS, VERY CLEARLY STATING THAT THE UNITED STATES DOESN'T NEGOTIATE AND DEAL WITH TERRORISTS. NOW WHAT YOU ARE TELLING US IS THAT IN EVERY TACTICAL SITUATION, THINGS ARE DIFFERENT, AND YOU HAVE TO MAKE UP YOUR MIND. AND YOU CERTAINLY CAN TALK -- YOU JUST DON'T MAKE CONCESSIONS.

A: THAT IS CORRECT.

Q: BUT IF THEY ASK TO SPEAK TO AMBASSADOR RUSH AND HE GOES OUT TO THE AIRPORT TO TALK TO THEM, THAT ISN'T A CONCESSION?

A: THE OBJECTIVE --

Q: HOW DO YOU DEFINE CONCESSION?

A: MARVIN, LOOK -- THE OBJECTIVE LAST SUNDAY, AS IN ANY OTHER HIJACKING INCIDENT, IS TO BRING THE THING TO A SUCCESSFUL CONCLUSION FROM OUR POINT OF VIEW. THAT WAS DONE ON SUNDAY. NOBODY ON BOARD THE PLANE WAS KILLED. THE HIJACKERS WERE ARRESTED. THEY HAVE BEEN SHIPPED BACK HERE FOR TRIAL. AND, IN MY VIEW, THAT INDICATES A SUCCESSFUL OPERATION. THAT IS THE ULTIMATE OBJECTIVE OF -- WHETHER

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 08 STATE 227368 TOSEC 270108

OR NOT YOU CALL IT A TALK OR A COMMUNICATION, THAT IS THE OBJECTIVE AND THAT IS WHAT WAS ACHIEVED.

Q: WAS THE STATE DEPARTMENT INVOLVED IN GETTING ANY SORT

OF PERMISSION FOR AN AMERICAN PLANE TO DROP LEAFLETS OVER LONDON AND PARIS, OR ANY AIR CLEARANCE OR MAKING SURE THAT NO OTHER PLANES WERE THERE TO RUN INTO THEM OR ANYTHING IN THE WAY OF ARRANGEMENTS?

A: WAS THE US GOVERNMENT INVOLVED IN THAT?

Q: YES.

A: I REALLY CANNOT ANSWER THAT QUESTION, TOTALLY. WHAT I CAN SAY --

Q: WAS THE STATE DEPARTMENT THOUGH?

A: WHAT I THINK I CAN SAY LOGICALLY IS THAT OBVIOUSLY THE AIRCRAFT HAD TO BE CLEARED OUT OF OUR AIRSPACE, THAT THE FAA HAD TO CONTROL IT, THAT THERE HAD TO BE COMMUNICATION WITH IT, AND IN THAT SENSE --

Q: IT WOULD HAVE TO BE CLEARED TO FLY LOW OVER LONDON AND PARIS TOO, WOULDN'T IT?

A: I WOULD IMAGINE IT WOULD HAVE TO BE; BUT IN TERMS OF THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS, I REALLY CANNOT TELL YOU.

Q: WELL, IS IT POSSIBLE TO INQUIRE WHETHER THE US GOVERNMENT, USING THE STATE DEPARTMENT AS ITS FOREIGN ARM, WAS INVOLVED IN CLEARING THESE PLANES TO GO DOWN AND DROP LEAFLETS OVER LONDON AND PARIS?

A: YOU ARE USING THE TERM 'INVOLVED WITH' IN A VERY LOOSE SENSE.

Q: WELL, IT SEEMS TO ME THE WHOLE THING IS KIND OF LOOSE HERE BUT, YOU KNOW, IT SEEMS TO ME THAT YOU'RE INVOLVED IN MAKING CONCESSIONS IF IN FACT THE GOVERNMENT HELPED TO ARRANGE FOR THE PLANE TO DROP LEAFLETS.
UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 09 STATE 227368 TOSEC 270108

A: NO, I WOULD NOT AGREE WITH YOU ON THAT POINT. LET ME LOOK INTO YOUR OTHER QUESTION, ALL RIGHT?

Q: ONE POINT.

A: YES, SIR.

Q: IT'S NOT INTENDED TO BE RHETORICAL.

A: NO.

Q: THESE REFINEMENTS IN YOUR POLICY THAT YOU'RE DESCRIBING TODAY ON THIS ISSUE -- THEY ARE ALL CLEARED

AND ACCENTED BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE; HE WENT THROUGH THIS WHOLE BUSINESS?

A: FIRST OF ALL, I WOULD SAY THAT THE REFINEMENTS -- WHAT YOU DESCRIBE AS REFINEMENTS --

Q: WHAT YOU DESCRIBE AS NO CHANGE.

A: -- I DESCRIBE AS NO CHANGE AND SIMPLY AN ENNUNCIATION OF WHAT HAS BEEN THE CASE, MARVIN. THAT IS THE FIRST POINT I MAKE.

Q: I JUST WANT TO BE CLEAR BECAUSE THE SECRETARY OF STATE IS ON MANY TIMES WITH VERY FIRM LANGUAGE CONCERNING DEALING OF ANY KIND WITH TERRORISTS. I JUST WANT TO BE CLEAR THAT THIS LANGUAGE IS ALSO BEING GIVEN TO US WITH HIS FULL AUTHORITY.

A: THIS IS THE STATE DEPARTMENT POSITION.

Q: WELL, I'M ASKING YOU HIS.

A: THE SECRETARY RUNS THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

Q: SO IT'S HIS?

A: RIGHT.
UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 10 STATE 227368 TOSEC 270108

Q: LET ME GO BACK TO ONE THING YOU SAID EARLIER. YOU POINTED OUT -- YOU SAID THE STATE DEPARTMENT DID NOT APPROVE THE PUBLICATION OF THESE TRACTS BY THE HIJACKERS.

A: YES.

Q: DOES THE STATE DEPARTMENT DISAPPROVE IT? DOES IT FEEL THAT IT WAS A BAD IDEA OR A GOOD IDEA?

A: TWA MADE THE DECISION TO ACCEDE TO THIS PARTICULAR DEMAND. I CAN ONLY REITERATE, IN ANSWER TO YOUR QUESTION 'DID WE APPROVE?' -- MY ANSWER IS: NO, WE DID NOT. BUT SINCE NO US LAW WAS BEING VIOLATED, WE WERE NOT IN A POSITION TO INTERVENE.

Q: DO YOU NOW FEEL IT WAS A BAD IDEA?

A: AFTER THE FACT I AM NOT GOING TO OFFER AN EVALUATION OF WHETHER IT WAS GOOD OR BAD. I AM SIMPLY REPLYING TO YOUR QUESTION OF APPROVAL FOR THAT ACT OF ACCEDING TO THE DEMAND.

Q: HOW DID THE FBI GET INTO THE ACT?

A: THE FBI IS CALLED IN ON A HIJACKING WHICH TAKES PLACE IN THE UNITED STATES AND, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, WHEN THE BREAKING OF FEDERAL LAW IS INVOLVED -- WHICH IMMEDIATELY ACTIVATES FBI INTEREST.

Q: WELL, WHAT I MEANT WAS HOW DID THEY BECOME A TRANSMISSION BELT BETWEEN WHAT YOU DESCRIBED AS TWA OR THE HIJACKERS AND THE NEWSPAPERS?

A: I AM NOT INFORMED OF THE DETAILS OF HOW THE COMMUNICATION WENT BACK AND FORTH IN TERMS OF THEIR INVOLVEMENT, THEIR LIAISON, WHAT HAVE YOU. I SIMPLY DO NOT HAVE THAT INFORMATION.

Q: FRED, AS I UNDERSTAND YOUR POSITION, IT IS THAT THE FBI WAS SIMPLY TRANSMITTING A REQUEST FROM TWA, THAT UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 11 STATE 227368 TOSEC 270108

IT WAS NOT A REQUEST FROM THE FBI, THAT THIS PUBLICATION BE MADE.

A: HENRY, I AM SORRY, BUT I MUST ASK YOU TO ADDRESS QUESTIONS WITH REGARD TO THE FBI'S ACTIONS --

Q: NO, BECAUSE --

A: -- ON HOW THINGS WORKED ON THE CONSULTATION.

Q: -- BECAUSE YOU TAKE THE POSITION THAT THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT DOES NOT MAKE CONCESSIONS. AND IF THE FBI WAS INVOLVED IN REQUESTING THIS ACTION, THEN WE HAVE A PROBLEM.

A: YES. WELL, DO ASK THE FBI ON THE THINKING AND THE RATIONALE FOR THEIR ACTIONS AND THE WAY THAT THE SCENARIO UNFOLDED SATURDAY NIGHT AND SUNDAY MORNING.

Q: BUT YOU'RE TAKING A POSITION WHICH COVERS THE FBI POSITION, IF YOUR POSITION IS THAT THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT DOES NOT MAKE CONCESSIONS IN THESE SITUATIONS. YOU'RE SPEAKING FOR THE FBI, IN OTHER WORDS, WHETHER YOU WANT TO OR NOT.

A: I AM ENUNCIATING OUR OFFICIAL ANTI-TERRORISM POLICY.

Q: WELL, LET ME PUT HANK'S QUESTION IN A DIFFERENT WAY. DOES THE DEPARTMENT BELIEVE THAT THE ACTION OF THE FBI WAS PROPER?

A: I AM NOT GOING TO GET INTO PLACING LABELS ON ACTIONS OR --

Q: ALL RIGHT. WHAT DOES THE DEPARTMENT THINK OF THE ACTION OF THE FBI?

A: I AM NOT GOING TO OFFER AN OPINION ON THAT.

Q: FRED, COULD YOU CHECK ON ONE THING, PLEASE? A COUPLE OF YEARS AGO AMBASSADOR CARTER -- WHOSE POST I BELIEVE, UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 12 STATE 227368 TOSEC 270108

WAS IN KENYA?

Q: TANZANIA.

A: TANZANIA.

Q: TANZANIA? -- WAS REPRIMANDED FOR HAVING TALKED TO TERRORISTS. COULD YOU FIND OUT FOR US, SINCE MY MEMORY IS JUST NOT GOOD ENOUGH. BUT THERE IS AN ISSUE THAT CAME UP THEN CONCERNING AN AMERICAN AMBASSADOR. THERE WAS A BIG FLAP. A MONTH OR TWO LATER HE WAS REMOVED FROM HIS JOB. HE'S NOW BEEN MOVED TO ANOTHER POST IN AFRICA. AND THE ISSUE AT THAT TIME WAS WHETHER THE UNITED STATES WOULD ALLOW ITS AMBASSADOR TO TALK TO -- TERRORISTS WHO HELD A NUMBER OF STUDENTS ATTENDING, I BELIEVE, STANFORD UNIVERSITY.

COULD YOU PLEASE CHECK ON THAT -- BECAUSE IF, IN FACT,

AS YOU SAID AT THE BEGINNING OF THIS EXCHANGE, THERE HAS BEEN NO CHANGE IN OUR POLICY, THEN WHAT DID HAPPEN AT THAT TIME WITH AMBASSADOR CARTER?

A: I WILL HAVE TO CHECK INTO THAT, MARVIN, BUT I WOULD MAKE THE OBSERVATION THAT I DO NOT ACCEPT AUTOMATICALLY YOUR STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE WITH REGARD TO AMBASSADOR CARTER IS ABSOLUTELY ACCURATE.

Q: I SAID MY MEMORY MAY BE FAULTY.

A: YES.

Q: THAT'S WHY I AM ASKING YOU TO CHECK.

A: I AM NOT CONVINCED THAT IT WAS A QUESTION OF TALKING, SO I AM AFRAID I CANNOT ACCEPT YOUR BASIC PREMISE. BUT I WILL LOOK INTO IT.

Q: DID AMBASSADOR RUSH CONSULT WITH THE DEPARTMENT BEFORE DECIDING TO TALK WITH THE HIJACKERS IN PARIS OR WAS THAT DONE ON HIS OWN?
UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 13 STATE 227368 TOSEC 270108

A: HE DID CONSULT. YES, SIR? WAIT A MINUTE -- EXCUSE ME. ANYTHING MORE ON THE HIJACKING BEFORE WE GO TO SOMETHING ELSE? OK? YES.

Q: THE ISRAELI AMBASSADOR LAST NIGHT CANCELLED HIS TRIP TO JERUSALEM IN ORDER TO LAUNCH A NEGOTIATION HERE WITH THE STATE DEPARTMENT ON THE CONTROVERSY REGARDING THE OIL-DRILLING IN THE SUEZ -- THE GULF. COULD YOU REDEFINE YOUR POSITION REGARDING THAT ISSUE, PLEASE?

A: I CANNOT DEFINE IT BEYOND WHAT I SAID BEFORE -- NAMELY, THAT THERE IS A DIFFERENCE OF OPINION ON THIS SUBJECT WHICH IS IN THE PROCESS OF BEING DISCUSSED BETWEEN OUR TWO GOVERNMENTS -- AND, INDEED, THAT AN ISRAELI DELEGATION IS COMING HERE, WILL BEGIN TALKS WITH US ON THURSDAY, AND THEY WILL CONCERN QUESTIONS WHICH HAVE ARISEN REGARDING THE ACTIVITIES OF THE AMERICAN OIL COMPANY, AMOCO, IN THE GULF OF SUEZ.

NOW, AS TO THE DETAILS OF THOSE DISCUSSIONS, I AM NOT IN A POSITION TO SET FORTH OUR POSITION ANY FURTHER OR TO REALLY DISCUSS THESE NEGOTIATIONS AT THIS TIME. OBVIOUSLY, WE ARE MOVING INTO A SITUATION OF FURTHER DETAILED DISCUSSION; AND IT WOULD BE IMPROPER FOR ME TO OFFER ANY KIND OF COMMENT ON THAT AT THIS MOMENT.

Q: IS IT TRUE THAT THE NEGOTIATIONS HAVE SHIFTED FROM JERUSALEM TO HERE? THEY WERE BEING CONDUCTED BY THE AMERICAN AMBASSADOR DIRECTLY WITH MR. RABIN.

A: I AM NOT INFORMED AS TO WHETHER THERE HAS BEEN ACTUALLY A SHIFT OF VENUE FOR THESE PARTICULAR NEGOTIATIONS. MY INFORMATION IS THAT THE ISRAELI DELEGATION COMING HERE WILL CONTINUE THE DISCUSSIONS THAT HAVE BEEN GOING ON. SO IN THAT SENSE WE HAVE BEEN HAVING DISCUSSIONS HERE -- AS I MENTIONED LAST WEEK -- AND I WAS NOT AWARE OF THE DETAILED DISCUSSIONS GOING ON IN JERUSALEM, FRANKLY.

Q: DO YOU KNOW BY NAME ANY MEMBERS OF THE ISRAELI UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 14 STATE 227368 TOSEC 270108

DELEGATION WHICH IS COMING HERE? WHO ARE THEY, I MEAN.

A: I HAVE ONE NAME -- THE HEAD OF THE DELEGATION, MR. EVRON. HE IS THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF THE ISRAELI FOREIGN MINISTRY. I DO NOT HAVE OTHER NAMES.

Q: AND WHO ON THE AMERICAN SIDE WILL BE THE NEGOTIATOR?

A: HE WILL MEET WITH UNDER SECRETARY HABIB AND ASSISTANT SECRETARY ATHERTON. I SUSPECT THERE WILL BE OTHER PEOPLE INVOLVED, BUT THOSE ARE THE TWO PRINCIPALS.

Q: NOW, HOW MANY ARE IN THE DELEGATION COMING OVER?

A: I AM AFRAID I DO NOT KNOW.

Q: WHAT WAS THE QUESTION?

A: HOW MANY PEOPLE IN THE DELEGATION. I REALLY DO NOT KNOW, HENRY.

Q: AS FAR AS I KNOW, IT'S ONLY MR. EVRON.

Q: MAYBE A NAVAL OFFICER, I THINK.

A: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS? THANK YOU VERY MUCH."

ROBINSON

UNCLASSIFIED

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 16 SEP 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: TOSEC, TEXT, PRESS CONFERENCES
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 14 SEP 1976
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: n/a
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: n/a
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment:
Disposition Date: 01 JAN 1960
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1976STATE227368
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: S/PRS:FZBROWN:SM
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: D760347-0107
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1976/newtext/t197609108/baaaeqbe.tel
Line Count: 618
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, TEXT ON MICROFILM
Office: ORIGIN PRS
Original Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 12
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: n/a
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: vandyklc
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 02 AUG 2004
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <02 AUG 2004 by schaeafaj>; APPROVED <17 AUG 2004 by vandyklc>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
04 MAY 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: DAILY PRESS BRIEFING TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14
TAGS: SOPN, OVIP, (KISSINGER, HENRY A)
To: SECRETARY
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006